

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 20 were pending in the present application when last examined; claims 15 to 18 were withdrawn. Applicant has amended claims 2, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 20, and canceled claims 1, 15, and 19. Claims 2 to 14, 16 to 18, and 20 remain pending.

### Claim Rejections

#### Claims 1 and 2

Applicant has canceled claim 1, thereby rendering its rejection moot.

Applicant has amended claim 2 to independent form to include the limitations of claim 1. The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,282,214 ("Dravida et al.") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,482 ("Wong et al."). Specifically, the Examiner found:

However, Dravida does not explicitly teach the specific use of adjusting at least one of the first and the second remainders based on the number,  $n-k$ , of trailing zeros in the composite sub-message.

Wong, in an analogous art, teaches that a message  $M(x)=D(x)$  in col. 3, lines 51-67 of Wong includes  $n-k$  trailing zeroes required to generate an  $n$ -bit codeword from a  $k$ -bit message where  $n>k$ . Since  $r_i(x)$  in Dravida is adjusted to produce  $R'(x)$  for all message bits in  $M(x)=D(x)$  it is also adjusted based on the number,  $n-k$ , of trailing zeros in the composite sub-message.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Dravida with the teaching of Wong by including use of adjusting at least one of the first and the second remainders based on the number,  $n-k$ , of trailing zeros in the composite sub-message. This modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that use of adjusting at least one of the first and the second remainders based on the number,  $n-k$ , of trailing zeros in the composite sub-message would have provided  $n-k$  trailing zeroes required to generate a  $n$ -bit codeword from a  $k$ -bit message where  $n>k$ .

December 5, 2006 Office Action (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Amended claim 2 recites "adjusting at least one of the first and the second remainders based on the number,  $n$ , of trailing zeros in the composite sub-message," which is not disclosed by Wong et al. The cited lines of Wong et al. at most disclose adjusting a systematic code  $D(x)$  by adding  $n-k$  number of trailing zeroes to systematic code  $D(x)$  to bring the total number of bits to

96 (51 data bits and 45 parity bits). Thus, Wong et al. does not disclose adjusting any remainder based on the number of trailing zeroes in systematic code D(x). Accordingly, amended claim 2 is patentable over the combination of Drvaida et al. and Wong et al.

#### Claims 7, 8, and 11 to 14

Claims 7, 8, and 11 to 14 depend from amended claim 2 and are patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2.

#### Claims 19 and 20

Applicant has canceled claim 19, thereby rendering its rejection moot.

Applicant has amended claim 20 to independent form to include the limitations of claim 19. Amended claim 20 recites similar limitations as amended claim 2 and is patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 3 to 6, 9, and 10 are patentable if amended to independent form including the limitations of their base claims and intervening claims.

Applicant has not amended claims 3 to 6 to independent form because Applicant believes their base claim 2 is patentable over the cited references.

Applicant has amended claim 9 to independent form. Accordingly, amended claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 10 depends from amended claim 9 and is in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as amended claim 9.

#### Withdrawn Claims

Applicant has canceled withdrawn claim 15 and amended withdrawn claim 16 to independent claim form including the limitations of claim 15. Applicant notes that withdrawn claim 16 recites limitations similar to those found in amended claim 2 and is well served by the same search and examination. Should the Examiner allow amended claim 2, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reinstate withdrawn claims 16 to 18 and allow them to conserve valuable patent office resources.

## Summary

Claims 1 to 20 were pending in the present application when last examined; claims 15 to 18 were withdrawn. Applicant has amended claims 2, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, and 20, and canceled claims 1, 15, and 19. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the claim rejections and allow claims 2 to 14, 16 to 18, and 20. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480x206.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted prior to expiration of the set period of time by being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

/David C Hsia/  
Signature

March 5, 2007  
Date

Respectfully submitted,

/David C Hsia/

David C. Hsia  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 46,235

Patent Law Group LLP  
2635 North First St., Ste. 223  
San Jose, California 95134  
408-382-0480x206